

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BUMPERS and Mr. GORTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1401 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAST-TRACK LEGISLATION

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in the life of a country, as in the life of an individual, there are times when we must choose between moving forward and standing still. Our trade policy is at just such a crossroads: We must decide whether to help promote freer trade and more open markets or try to preserve the status quo.

As we confront this issue, we must recognize that the world is changing and that even an economic superpower can do no more than postpone the inevitable. Our resolution of this issue will determine whether the United States continues to move forward on a wave of export-driven growth or risks permitting other economies to leave us behind. I believe it is time to stand behind our commitment to free trade and work to bring other countries into open trading relationships that will mean jobs and prosperity for our citizens in the century ahead. That is why, Mr. President, I have decided to support the fast track legislation.

In developing my position on this legislation, I have been guided by one overriding consideration - will its enactment improve the lives of the people of Maine? Will it mean more customers for Maine businesses? Will it mean more opportunities for Maine entrepreneurs? And most important, will it mean more jobs for Maine workers? While free trade is not without problems, I firmly believe that the long-term answer to all of these questions is yes.

International trade is an increasingly critical part of Maine's economy. In 1996, for example, my State exported more than 1.2 billion dollars worth of goods. Considering both the direct and indirect impact, those exports translated into 13,500 Maine jobs.

But this export-led growth is just the beginning. I believe the people of Maine have the ingenuity, the drive, and the work ethic to flourish in a world of freer trade and more open markets for U.S. goods. From successful retailers like L.L. Bean, to manufacturers like Pratt & Whitney, to financial service companies like UNUM, to high-technology companies like Portland's ABB, to paper mills throughout my State, Maine enterprises have proven that they can compete in a global economy. These com-

panies recognize that much of their future revenue and job growth will come from serving customers beyond our borders.

This is well understood in Maine. The United Paperworkers International Union has pressed the administration to negotiate reductions in European tariffs to help open foreign markets to the products its members make in Maine and elsewhere and to generate more export-related jobs. As Prof. Charles Colgan of the University of Southern Maine, a noted trade expert, stated in a recent letter to me, "The . . . vote on Fast Track authority for the President to negotiate additional trade agreements is an important vote for Maine. International trade is an increasingly vital part of the Maine economy. . . ."

Perhaps the clearest reason to support fast-track authority was set forth in a letter from the State of Maine's director of International Trade, who wrote as follows: "I simply feel that our best hopes for long-term economic prosperity here in Maine lie in creating international opportunities for our people, and not in limiting our access to new and emerging economies. However, well-intentioned, restricting our ability to trade will never create new jobs for Maine people."

Mr. President, I said earlier that we face the decision of whether to move forward. But in reality, the world will change with or without us, and thus, the real question is not whether we move forward, but whether we move forward wisely. That is the standard against which we should judge our trade policy, and against which we should judge this legislation. To me, this means that our trade strategy must meet three tests.

First, since some citizens may be temporarily disadvantaged—through no fault of their own—by the changes freer trade can bring, we must assist them to adjust to changed conditions. Second, we must ensure that free trade is genuinely free, for that is what "fair trade" really means: If we do not insist that other countries open their markets to fair competition from U.S. goods, the system will collapse. Third, as we give the President the authority to negotiate trade agreements, we must preserve an appropriate role for Congress in this vital area of national policy.

After weeks of studying this issue, listening to my constituents, and consulting with U.S. trade officials, it has become clear to me that the renewal of fast-track authority meets my three criteria and is very much in the best interests of my country and my State.

First, while the rising economic tide that comes from free trade ultimately lifts all boats, it may impose costs upon some of our citizens in the short run. For this reason, I was greatly encouraged by the President's promise to expand Trade Adjustment Assistance programs—and to expand them to include not only workers directly af-

ected by trade adjustments but also workers in businesses supplying affected companies. This change should prove particularly beneficial to small businesses in Maine and elsewhere.

Second, I am pleased to have received assurances from the office of the U.S. Trade Representative that they share some of the important concerns of Maine's citizens with regard to ensuring that trade is really free. More specifically, Ambassador Barshefsky has made clear to me in writing that she regards Canada's bulk easement rules on potato imports to be an unfair trade barrier that must be pursued with the Canadian Government. Ambassador Barshefsky has committed to me that she will begin bilateral talks with the Canadian Government, beginning no later than March 1998. In addition, Ambassador Barshefsky has assured me that she views Canadian potato subsidies as a very serious matter that also must be addressed. Having established open markets as the norm, our trade officials must work—and, I have been assured, are working—to ensure that foreign governments keep their promises.

Furthermore, I want to emphasize that passage of this legislation will not in any way hinder the ability of an industry to bring challenges under current trade laws against unfair trade practices, such as subsidies provided by foreign governments. Members of the farmed salmon industry in Maine have brought such a case. They seek relief from the adverse effects of dumping and subsidization, and of unequal conditions of competition, which give their Chilean competitors an unfair and illegal advantage.

It was only after I became satisfied that fast track would not negatively affect the Maine salmon industry or its ability to pursue its legitimate grievances under current law that I decided to support this legislation. As a representative of the salmon industry recently advised me, what is most critical to them is "the preservation of effective remedies under existing law and their vigorous enforcement." This legislation not only preserves existing remedies but also has as one of its objectives the pursuit of illegal activities by other nations. Thus, it recognizes that free trade is not achieved by the stroke of a pen on an agreement but rather by a commitment to the vigorous enforcement of our trade laws.

Third, this bill carefully addresses the need to preserve the proper balance of powers and responsibilities within our Government. While it restricts Congress' power to amend the terms of trade agreements, it maintains our right to reject them. Indeed, it goes farther than any prior fast-track legislation to protect Congressional prerogatives. For example, it limits the application of the fast track to agreements which advance specifically enumerated negotiating objectives set out in the bill, which preserves our ultimate authority to set the goals of U.S. trade policy.

Moreover, the Senate version of the legislation contains more elaborate procedures than ever before to ensure that Congress is consulted at every step as the President negotiates trade agreements. The President must consult with or notify the relevant committees—or Congress as a whole—on at least five different occasions during the process, even before Congress begins drafting an agreement's implementing legislation. These requirements guarantee that at all times we will be fully informed of the progress of ongoing trade talks.

Most significantly, unlike past fast-track legislation, S. 1269 permits congressional disapproval of a trade agreement long before the stage of final ratification. After the President notifies Congress of his intent to negotiate a specific agreement, the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee may vote to "disapprove" the idea—thus removing it from the fast-track process and making it subject to ordinary amendment. Under this legislation, what Congress gives to the President it may also take away. In short, the bill allows America to move more quickly in a rapidly changing world, while making Congress more of a real partner in the negotiation of trade agreements.

The United States is one of the principal engines of the world economy in large part because it has long been one of the most open trading economies in the world. Continued progress in global trade liberalization—bringing other countries up to our high standards of market openness—is vital if we are to remain in the global driver's seat in the next century.

The road to free trade will not be without bumps, but it is a road I believe we must take, for at the end of that road will be a more prosperous Maine, a more prosperous America, and a more prosperous world. For that reason, I intend to vote for the fast-track legislation.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters from Ambassador Barshefsky, the Maine International Trade Center, Unum Insurance Co., Pratt & Whitney, and ABB Environmental Services be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
THE UNITED STATES TRADE
REPRESENTATIVE,

Washington, DC, November 6, 1997.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: Thank you for sharing your concerns regarding the need to create a fair and level playing field for potato growers in Maine.

I share your concerns regarding the need to address the difficult trade issues facing potato growers in Maine. As a result, I requested that the International Trade Commission conduct a section 332 investigation on fresh and processed potatoes, on an expedited basis, to provide the necessary information to assess the terms of trade between

U.S. and Canadian growers and processors. The Commission issued its report on July 18. We are now in the process of working with industry to determine the next steps given the information that was provided in the report.

One specific concern you mentioned is Canada's regulations governing interprovincial and import shipments of potatoes for repackaging and processing. It is our understanding that a processor intending to import bulk potatoes must obtain a Ministerial Exemption (Easement) to the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Regulations under the Canada Agricultural Products Act. Such an easement is only granted for the purposes of importation if a shortage of potatoes exists in Canada. Our exporters object to the apparent discriminatory and arbitrary manner in which this system operates. I agree that this unfair trade barrier should be addressed expeditiously and will engage Canadian officials in bilateral talks on this matter, beginning no later than March 1998. Please be assured that I am committed to pursuing this matter until we reach a fair resolution.

The second concern you raised is Canadian subsidies, and in specific, whether Canada is in compliance with its international obligations with respect to certain programs qualifying as "green box" support programs. I agree that a review should be conducted to determine whether or not certain Canadian subsidy programs now qualify as green box programs. We, together with USDA, will work with industry to determine which Canadian programs should be reviewed and will pursue any exceptions that are found.

It is my hope that this plan to address the trade concerns of Maine's potato growers will indeed level the playing field for Maine's potato growers.

Sincerely,

CHARLENE BARSHEFSKY.

MAINE INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTER,
Portland, ME, November 6, 1997.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Re Fast-Track Negotiating Authority.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: Thank you for your inquiry concerning the potential impact of "fast track" trade pact negotiating authority on Maine and Maine business. As Maine's Director of International Trade, I am pleased to share my thoughts on this important issue with you.

Free trade agreements such as the US-Canada Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA and Mercosur continue to be the subject of considerable debate and, unfortunately, misleading statistical analyses. Proponents and opponents alike are able to point to economic data that supports various aspects of their respective positions. Thus, although I am a strong supporter of free trade, and therefore NAFTA and "fast track" authority, it may be most helpful to provide you with a broader analysis of the issue and impact of Maine than to offer you raw data for which there will doubtless be a flipside analysis.

It is important to note at the outset, however, some incontrovertible facts. US exports to Canada have grown by 118% (from \$60.9 billion to \$132 billion) since the enactment of the US-Canada Free Trade Agreement. Maine's exports to Canada have grown from \$300 million in 1988 to \$546 million in 1996, an increase of 82%, in the same period.

Maine's export to Mexico in 1993 (pre-NAFTA) were \$18 million. In 1994, the first full year of NAFTA, Maine exported \$27 million of goods to Mexico. In 1995, following the peso crisis, Maine's exports to Mexico declined to \$14 million. In 1996, as Mexico's economy rebounded, Maine's exports to Mex-

ico rallied to \$34 million. In short, Maine's exports to Mexico have almost doubled since the passage of NAFTA.

Taken together, Maine's exports to Canada and Mexico have grown from \$472 million in 1994 to \$582 million in 1996, an increase of \$110 million in three years. In my view, the current improved condition of Maine's economy is attributable in part not only to the continued strength of the US economy generally but increased international commerce in particular. The US Government estimates that for every \$1 billion in exports, 40,000 jobs are created. The message is clear.

Opponents of fast track legislation and free trade agreements generally cite the dangers of "exporting jobs" to lower wage countries. This is a rational concern, and one not to be dismissed. I believe, however, that market forces will dictate in any case where a business owner will choose to locate her manufacturing facilities, and as things stand today there are already many lower wage environments that can be haven to such activities, if that is a manufacturer's primary consideration.

I continue to have ultimate confidence in the competitiveness of Maine's workers, products and services. Our goods and services are highly competitive and desired around the world. We have nothing to fear from enhanced competition—and once the doors to new markets are open to us, we can and do succeed. Our workers are second to none. High quality, premium and value-added goods are being produced in Maine today when many lower-cost markets are available for the purpose. In short, we have nothing to fear from world markets, so long as we recognize that we have to continue to strive to be the very best.

Erecting protectionist barriers will not insulate us from the forces of competition that are at work in the world today. We need access to other markets, just as we have been liberal in granting access to our own. History teaches us that the Maginot Line did nothing to prevent the advance of unwelcome intruders. Similarly, creating impediments to market entry will not protect us from larger competitive forces that may have an adverse impact on our economy. We need to embrace the current competitive environment and succeed in it.

Fast track authority will enable the President to conclude trade agreements that can create vistas of opportunity for Maine businesses. We need to have enough faith in our leadership, and in the political process, to trust that our concerns over environmental protection and job impact will be represented at the negotiating table. The cold, hard truth is that our competitors from around the globe are aggressively pursuing trading relationships in countries and markets that we cannot yet approach owing to trade barriers or other impediments. If we dither, or if we engage in protracted debate no matter how well-intentioned, we will be far behind the curve—and that will in the short, medium and long-term result in loss of opportunity for Maine businesses, and impact our economic growth.

I do not for a moment mean to minimize the potential for adverse short-term impacts owing to the opening of new markets. These are real concerns, although I believe history has shown that our economy can flourish in a free trade environment. I simply feel that our best hopes for long-term economic prosperity here in Maine lie in creating international opportunities for our people, and not in limiting our access to new and emerging economies. However well-intentioned, restricting our ability to trade will never create new jobs for Maine people.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment, and wish you the very best in your deliberations. With best regards, I am.

Very truly yours,

PERRY B. NEWMAN,
*Director of International Trade,
State of Maine and,
President, Maine International Trade Center.*

UNUM CORPORATION,
Portland, ME, October 30, 1997.

Senator SUSAN M. COLLINS,
Russell Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SUSAN: Earlier this year, Unum communicated support for passage of fast track trade negotiating legislation. As this issue moves forward in Congress, I wanted to write and reiterate our support for passage of this legislation.

Opening foreign markets has been critical for Unum in several of our recent international expansions. Currently, Unum has operations in the United Kingdom, Japan, Argentina, Bermuda, France, and Germany, along with the United States and Canada.

We will continue to expand internationally as opportunities present themselves. However, we have found that it is imperative that our government be able to negotiate aggressively with our trading partners in order to get the fair and open access that we need to be competitive. Fast track legislation gives our government the ability to negotiate these kinds of trade agreements. As you weigh the facts on this issue, I think you will see that this legislation is a necessary tool for our government to be successful in negotiating with foreign governments.

If you would like any additional information about Unum's international operations, I would be more than happy to provide it. As fast track legislation is considered by the Senate, I urge your support.

Sincerely,

BRIAN K. ATCHINSON,
2nd Vice President, External Affairs.

PRATT & WHITNEY,
North Berwick, ME, October 31, 1997.
Senator SUSAN M. COLLINS,
*Senate Russell Office Building, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: The president's authority to negotiate any major trade agreement has lapsed and must be authorized by Congress. I am writing to tell you why it is important to the people at Pratt & Whitney's North Berwick plant, and United Technologies, to pass legislation known as "fast track" authority this year.

Pratt & Whitney's business success in the U.S. depends to a significant degree on our ability to sell our products in markets abroad. Our government's negotiators need fast track authority to open markets, reduce tariffs and eliminate trade barriers to U.S. products. Negotiators will not be taken seriously if it is perceived that they do not have the authority to conclude an agreement.

Fast track is not a new concept, and it does not result in us "rushing into trade agreements". It has been a procedure used since 1974 and has been renewed many times by Congress. Fast track does not remove Congress' involvement in trade agreements because the legislation includes specific negotiating objectives and a consultation mechanism whereby the president is obligated to consult with Congress during the negotiating of trade agreements. All fast track ensures is that once an agreement is reached, with congressional permission and consultation, it will not be amended after it is signed.

Why is fast track important to our economy? Because trade creates and supports

jobs in the U.S. and in Maine. The opponents of fast track would have us halt our participation in the global economy. That approach is the greatest threat to jobs in the U.S., especially for companies like United Technologies that export over \$3 billion per year. We need fast track to stay competitive, and maintain a strong economy.

I urge you to press for speedy consideration of the fast track legislation in Congress this year.

Sincerely,

R. E. PONCHAK,
General Manager.

ABB ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.,
Portland, ME, October 7, 1997.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of ABB Inc., I am writing to urge you to support renewing fast track authority for the President. More than one third of the economic growth and nearly 40 percent of the new jobs created since 1993 are based on exports. Since only 4 percent of the world's consumers reside in the U.S., future growth and job creation will rely heavily on exports and the ability of the U.S. to access global markets. In order for the U.S. to be able to eliminate trade barriers and thus open foreign markets to U.S. goods and services, the President must have the proper authority to negotiate trade agreements from a position of strength, where the U.S. will be able to maintain its place as a world economic leader. Fast track will provide the President with this authority.

Fast track authority is especially important to ABB Inc. Our operations in the U.S. are becoming increasingly reliant on exports. So far, ABB's exports in 1997 have grown over 40 percent. The ability to gain greater access to markets all over the world and especially in Latin America and Asia is vital to the well-being of our company and employees. Fast track authority will ensure that ABB's interests abroad, as well as those of other U.S. companies, will be preserved.

Every President since 1974 has had fast track trade negotiating authority. Without fast track, the U.S. will be at a competitive disadvantage by permitting other countries to gain preferential market treatment at the expense of the American worker. Since fast track authority expired in 1994, more than twenty trade expansion agreements have been negotiated without the U.S.

Once again, I am requesting that you endorse fast track negotiating authority for the President. Please help support a strong American economy and jobs for the future by supporting fast track.

Sincerely,

DAVID P. CSINTYAN,
Office Manager.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROTH. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business until 1 p.m. with Senators per-

mitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO S. 1269

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, at this moment I am filing at the desk four amendments that at the appropriate time I would make efforts to attach to S. 1269, the fast-track legislation.

The chairman is on the floor and I would provide him with a packet of information as it relates to these amendments. None of us yet know the fate of fast track or if the House will be able to engender the necessary votes to pass this legislation.

Clearly, I think the proper refinement of fast track broadens its ability to be passed and to become law, and it becomes very important to all of us, if that is the case, that it does. I have reservations about giving the President this authority, and yet at the same time I have not stood in the way that the process be expedited to get it to the floor for a vote. But the amendments that I am filing this afternoon that I think are important are a product of the frustrations that American producers have experienced as a result of the mid-1980's North American Canadian Free-Trade Agreement and then, of course, NAFTA, the North American Free-Trade Agreement in the early 1990's.

One of my amendments deals with the commodity problems that we have primarily in agriculture but also in the forest products industry between Canada and the United States. The flow of commodity interest is largely one way at this moment, from Canada into the United States—live cattle impacting our markets, grain bypassing through the Canadian Grain Board, the protocol of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. We have just had disputes with Canada over poultry and dairy products. We now see a flood of potatoes coming out of Canada, potatoes last year that depressed the United States producer price to almost a historic low level, putting farmers in Idaho, Washington, and Maine in jeopardy.

As a result of that, one of my amendments would establish a bilateral joint commission to identify and recommend means of resolving national regional and provincial trading or trade distortions and differences between the United States and Canada with respect to the production, processing and sales of agricultural commodities. I have explained the reason why, and if we get